



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/753,297	01/08/2004	Steven M. Miller	RSW920030284US1	7583
51016 7590 11/13/2007 IBM CORP. (RALEIGH SOFTWARE GROUP) c/o Rudolf O Siegesmund Gordon & Rees, LLP 2100 Ross Avenue Suite 2800 DALLAS, TX 75201			EXAMINER WONG, WILLIAM	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/753,297

Applicant(s)

MILLER ET AL.

Examiner

William Wong

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 August 2007 and 23 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the following communications: RCE filed on August 30, 2007 and amendments filed July 23, 2007.

- Claims 1, 20, 22, 41, 43, and 56 have been amended.

Claims 1-56 are pending and have been examined. Previous 35 USC 112 rejections have been withdrawn in view of amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 8-26, 29-43, and 46-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fullerton et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0033296 A1) in view of Dieberger et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0122863 A1), Yacovone et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0109712 A1), and Microsoft PowerPoint 2000 (screen printout pages 1-14 demonstrating a step by step guide showing some of the features of PowerPoint 2000, herein referred to as "Microsoft", see appendix section below for more details).

Claim 1

As per claim 1, Fullerton teaches a **method** (e.g. in the title, "Method and apparatus for delivery and presentation of data") **for deploying an intelligent agenda program on a computer, the method comprising the steps of: installing the intelligent agenda program on the computer** (e.g. in paragraph 14 on page 2, "a computer program product for use with a computer system having a display and capable of generating a presentation from a stream of data, the computer program product comprising a computer useable medium having program code embodied therein comprising: (a) program code for accessing the stream of data; (b) program code for extracting content data from the stream of data; (c) program code for presenting the content data on the display; (d) program code for extracting outline data representing a plurality of data segments within the presentation, the data segments linked to respective segments of the presentation"); **wherein the intelligent agenda program displays an outline of a plurality of slides created by a presentation program** (e.g. in paragraph 14 on page 2, "... and (e) program code for presenting the outline data on the display simultaneously with the presentation of the content data" and figure 6); and **wherein the outline displays a contextual location of a current slide in a presentation** (e.g. in paragraph 185 on page 9, "The Outline Window 238 also provides progress feedback and context

information to the user by highlighting the current outline segment and may be visible by default. Alternatively, a visual icon 239 may be utilized to indicate the current segment” and figure 6). Fullerton further teaches that the outline can be hidden or displayed and moved around on the screen (e.g. in paragraph 180 on page 8), but does not specifically teach displaying the outline **in a corner on each of the plurality of slides, separating the outline from the remainder of each of the plurality of slides by a user configurable line, and wherein the intelligent agenda program automatically creates the outline from a title of each of the slides in the presentation.**

However, Dieberger teaches displaying an outline in a corner on the slides (e.g. in figure 1, outline is shown in the upper left corner, and paragraphs 20-21 and 36) and separating the outline from the remainder of the slides by a line (e.g. in figure 1, border). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Fullerton with the display method of the outline of Dieberger because it would provide more viewing space for the presentation content, and easily display the contextual information in a non-intrusive manner (e.g. in paragraph 21 and 25 of page 2).

It was also well known in the art to configure lines/border of elements displayed in a slide show presentation, as shown by Microsoft (e.g. in figures 5-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the outline of Fullerton to also include the formatting of Microsoft for the purpose of providing the presentation creator the ability to modify the appearance of the outline.

Fullerton discloses simultaneous display of the presentation and outline (e.g. in paragraph 9, "windows for simultaneous display of a presentation, an abstract outline of the presentation and linking data to other relevant resources. The presentation content, outline and linking data are linked to allow for more efficient navigation and interaction with the presentation" and in figure 6). Therefore, it would have also been obvious to apply the modifications of Dieberger and Microsoft to each of the slides of Fullerton for the purpose of preserving the consistent contextual information provided by the outline to viewers of the presentation.

Furthermore, Yacovone teaches automatically creating the outline from the title of each of the slides in the presentation (e.g. in paragraph 41 on page 4, "Upon receiving the uploaded content, i.e., presentation slides 38 in this example ... The host system extracts the title of each slide (if PowerPoint®) and stores each slide title in the database for use later during playback by the viewer in the form of an active table-of-contents" and figure 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Fullerton to include the outline creation method of Yacovone for the purpose of automating the generation of the outline data.

Claim 2

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the intelligent agenda program allows a user to re-organize the outline** (e.g. in paragraph 320-321, "Data in a Discourse file is interleaved in a way that facilitates later modification and editing without the need to reference original source media. This means that an on-site administrator can copy and paste content between different Discourse files to add or remove portions, or construct a customized lesson from smaller pieces... Discourse [file] further includes annotation of media with outline entries, transcripts, hyperlinks, and even selectable areas and command scripts").

Claim 3

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **accepting a user configured format of the outline, and displaying the outline on the slides in the user configured format** (e.g. in paragraph 180 on page 8, "The Discourse player 225 and user interface 230 presents several windows to the user. Each of these windows can be hidden or displayed, enabled or disabled, and moved around the screen at the discretion of either the user or the presentation creator" and in paragraph 205 on page 10, "The duration, in minutes and seconds, of

the segment may be displayed next to each entry [in the outline]. If the entry is a hierarch then the sum of the times of it children may be displayed in italic. These durations may reside in a resizable column on the right side of the window...").

Claim 4

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **determining whether a user has configured a display option, and responsive to the determination that the user has not configured the display option, displaying the outline with all of the topics in the outline expanded** (e.g. in figure 6 in view of paragraph 209 on page 10, "Selecting the twiddles in front of outline hierarchs will collapse or expand them. The state of the icon may reflect their collapsed or expanded state"; users can expand or collapse parts of the outline, but by default all the topics are expanded).

Claim 5

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **responsive to the determination that the user has configured a display option, determining whether the user has selected an outline expansion option, and responsive to the determination that the user has selected the outline expansion option, displaying the outline according to the outline expansion**

Art Unit: 2178

option selected by the user (e.g. in paragraph 209 on page 10, "Selecting the twiddles in front of outline hierarchys will collapse or expand them. The state of the icon may reflect their collapsed or expanded state").

Claim 8

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated. Fullerton teaches the method of claim 5, but does not specifically teach expanding **only the current topic**. However, Fullerton teaches user selectable options or preferences (e.g. in paragraph 12 on page 2 and in paragraph 253 on page 11), which could be used to expand only the current topic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Fullerton using the user preferences to include expanding only the current topic in order to prevent the user from being overwhelmed with information and therefore provide a better contextual understanding of the material being presented.

Claim 9

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **responsive to the determination that the user has configured a display option, determining whether the user has limited the number of displayed lines on the outline; and responsive to the determination that the user has limited the number of lines on the outline, modifying the outline to the number of displayed**

lines limited by the user (e.g. in paragraph 188 on page 9, "The user interface of the Discourse player may be designed to obey the standard user interface guidelines of the native operating systems 250. Unlike other multimedia player environments which take over the entire screen, blocking out other applications, a Discourse presentation uses standard windowing routines that co-exist with other applications" and in paragraph 192 on page 9, "Main movie window 232 may be resizable by the user with the normal resizing controls..."; windows can be resized by the user, which would inherently determine the number of lines shown in the outline).

Claim 10

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the immediately adjacent topics are displayed in any remaining lines** (e.g. in figure 6).

Claim 11

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the topics above the current topic and the immediately adjacent topics are displayed, subject to the user limited number of lines** (e.g. in figure 6).

Claim 12

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **responsive to the determination that the user has configured a display option, determining whether the user has limited the type of displayed topics on the outline, and responsive to the determination that the user has limited the number of topics on the outline, modifying the outline to the type of displayed topics limited by the user** (e.g. in paragraph 209 on page 10, "Selecting the twiddles in front of outline hierarchys will collapse or expand them. The state of the icon may reflect their collapsed or expanded state"; the user is able to limit the type of topics displayed on the outline by collapsing portions of the outline, which also inherently limits the number of topics on the outline).

Claim 13

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated. Fullerton teaches the method of claim 12, but does not specifically teach **not displaying previous topics**. However, Fullerton teaches user selectable options or preferences (e.g. in paragraph 12 on page 2 and in paragraph 253 on page 11), which could be used to expand only the current topic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Fullerton using the user preferences to include not displaying previous topics in order to focus the viewer's attention to the

Art Unit: 2178

topics left to cover in the presentation and prevent the user from being overwhelmed with information.

Claim 14

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated. Fullerton teaches the method of claim 12, but does not specifically teach **not displaying subsequent topics**. However, Fullerton teaches user selectable options or preferences (e.g. in paragraph 12 on page 2 and in paragraph 253 on page 11), which could be used to expand only the current topic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Fullerton using the user preferences to include not displaying previous topics in order to focus the user's attention to topics that have been and are currently being covered in the presentation and prevent the user from being overwhelmed with information.

Claim 15

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated. Fullerton teaches the method of claim 3, but does not specifically teach **wherein the user configured format is a color and a line**. However, it was well known in the art to configure colors and lines of elements displayed in a slide show presentation, as shown by Microsoft (in figures 8-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the outline of Fullerton to include the formatting of

Art Unit: 2178

Microsoft for the purpose of providing the user increased control in the appearance of the presentation.

Claim 16

As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the user configured format is a size of the outline** (e.g. in paragraph 205 on page 10, "The duration, in minutes and seconds, of the segment may be displayed next to each entry [in the outline]. If the entry is a hierarch then the sum of the times of it children may be displayed in italic. These durations may reside in a resizable column on the right side of the window...").

Claim 17

As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the user configured format is a layout of the outline** (e.g. in paragraph 180 on page 8, "The Discourse player 225 and user interface 230 presents several windows to the user. Each of these windows can be hidden or displayed, enabled or disabled, and moved around the screen at the discretion of either the user or the presentation creator").

Art Unit: 2178

Claim 18

As per claim 18, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the user configured format pertains to a picture associated with the outline** (e.g. in paragraph 185 on page 9, "The Outline Window 238 also provides progress feedback and context information to the user by highlighting the current outline segment and may be visible by default. Alternatively, a visual icon 239 may be utilized to indicate the current segment" and in paragraph 114 on page 114, "Double and single clicking the pointer may also be used to cause the pointer to disappear and reappear, respectively, on the display 238 in the same manner").

Claim 19

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **wherein the user configured format pertains to a text box associated with the outline** (e.g. in paragraph 205 on page 10, "The duration, in minutes and seconds, of the segment may be displayed next to each entry [in the outline]. If the entry is a hierarch then the sum of the times of it children may be displayed in italic. These durations may reside in a resizable column on the right side of the window..."; the outline window is the text display area or text box).

Claim 20

As per claim 20, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, but Fullerton does not specifically teach **wherein the user configured format pertains to a user defined text to display when an image cannot be displayed**. However, the above limitation was well known in the art, as shown by Microsoft (in figure 12). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Fullerton to include this formatting of Microsoft for the purpose of providing viewers with supplementary information when pictures are loading or missing.

Claim 21

As per claim 21, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Fullerton further teaches **the intelligent agenda contains a timer displaying the approximate duration of each slide** (e.g. in paragraph 205 on page 10, "The duration, in minutes and seconds, of the segment may be displayed next to each entry [in the outline]").

Claims 22-26 and 29-42

Claims 22-26 and 29-42 are the program product claims corresponding to the method claims 1-5 and 8-21 respectively, and are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-21.

Fullerton further teaches a program product on a computer-usable medium (e.g. in figure 2 and in paragraph 328 on page 13, "A software implementation of the above described embodiment(s) may comprise a series of computer instructions either fixed on a tangible medium, such as a computer readable media...").

Claims 43 and 46-56

Claims 43 and 46-56 are the apparatus claims corresponding to the method claims 1-5 and 8-21, and are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-21.

Fullerton further teaches an apparatus (e.g. in the title, "Method and apparatus for delivery and presentation of data") comprising a means for accepting (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "User input to computer system 100 may be provided by a number of devices. For example, a keyboard 156 and mouse 157 are connected to bus 130 by controller 155..."), means for displaying (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "A visual display is generated by video controller 165 which controls video display 170"), means for determining (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "Computer system 100 includes a central processing unit (CPU) 105, which may be implemented with a conventional microprocessor"), and means for modifying (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "User input to computer system 100 may be provided by a number of

Art Unit: 2178

devices. For example, a keyboard 156 and mouse 157 are connected to bus 130 by controller 155...").

3. Claims 6, 27, and 44 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fullerton et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0033296 A1), Dieberger et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0122863 A1), Yacovone et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0109712 A1), and Microsoft PowerPoint 2000 (screen printout pages 1-14 demonstrating a step by step guide showing some of the features of PowerPoint 2000) in view of Lee et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0218639 A1).

Claim 6

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated. Fullerton further teaches the method of claim 5, but does not specifically teach **wherein the outline expansion option is to expand all levels of the outline**. However, Lee teaches the above limitation (e.g. in figure 5 and in paragraph 28 on page 3, "As seen by the highlighted background, the user selects the "Expand all" option 510, selecting automatic expansion of the tree. This feature of the invention expands the tree in its entirety"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Fullerton with the expansion option of Lee because it would allow the user to quickly and easily expand the outline for viewing, without having to individually expand the nodes.

Claim 27

Claim 27 is the program product claim corresponding to the method claim 6, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 6.

Fullerton further teaches a program product on a computer-usable medium (e.g. in figure 2 and in paragraph 328 on page 13, "A software implementation of the above described embodiment(s) may comprise a series of computer instructions either fixed on a tangible medium, such as a computer readable media...").

Claims 44

The rejection of claim 43 is incorporated, and claim 44 is the apparatus claim corresponding to the method claim 6, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 6.

Fullerton further teaches an apparatus (e.g. in the title, "Method and apparatus for delivery and presentation of data") comprising a means for accepting (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "User input to computer system 100 may be provided by a number of devices. For example, a keyboard 156 and mouse 157 are connected to bus 130 by controller 155..."), means for displaying (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "A visual display is generated by video controller 165 which controls video display 170"), means for determining (e.g. in paragraph 32 on

Art Unit: 2178

page 3, "Computer system 100 includes a central processing unit (CPU) 105, which may be implemented with a conventional microprocessor"), and means for modifying (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "User input to computer system 100 may be provided by a number of devices. For example, a keyboard 156 and mouse 157 are connected to bus 130 by controller 155...").

4. Claims 7, 28, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fullerton et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0033296 A1), Dieberger et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0122863 A1), Yacovone et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0109712 A1), and Microsoft PowerPoint 2000 (screen printout pages 1-14 demonstrating a step by step guide showing some of the features of PowerPoint 2000) in view of Good et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2005/0138570 A1).

Claim 7

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated. Fullerton further teaches the method of claim 5, but does not specifically teach **wherein the outline expansion option is to expand a user-configurable number of levels of the outline**. However, Good teaches the above limitation (e.g. in item 30 of figure 1 in view of paragraph 18 on page 2, "The menu 30 consists of entries to close ancestors of the selected node 20', the selected node 20', and options to individually open the nodes at each level of the hierarchy 40

Art Unit: 2178

below the selected node 20'. Each descendent level indicates the number of nodes that would be shown below the selected level 20', should the hierarchy 40 be opened to that level"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Fullerton with the expansion option of Good because it would allow the user to quickly and easily expand the outline for viewing, without having to individually expand the nodes (e.g. in paragraph 18 on page 2, "The multilevel expand/collapse navigation aid thus saves the user from having either to expand the structure 40 by manually expanding multiple individual nodes 20 within that structure").

Claim 28

Claim 28 is the program product claim corresponding to the method claim 7, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 7.

Fullerton further teaches a program product on a computer-usable medium (e.g. in figure 2 and in paragraph 328 on page 13, "A software implementation of the above described embodiment(s) may comprise a series of computer instructions either fixed on a tangible medium, such as a computer readable media...").

Claims 45

The rejection of claim 43 is incorporated, and claim 45 is the apparatus claim corresponding to the method claim 7, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 7.

Fullerton further teaches an apparatus (e.g. in the title, "Method and apparatus for delivery and presentation of data") comprising a means for accepting (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "User input to computer system 100 may be provided by a number of devices. For example, a keyboard 156 and mouse 157 are connected to bus 130 by controller 155..."), means for displaying (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "A visual display is generated by video controller 165 which controls video display 170"), means for determining (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "Computer system 100 includes a central processing unit (CPU) 105, which may be implemented with a conventional microprocessor"), and means for modifying (e.g. in paragraph 32 on page 3, "User input to computer system 100 may be provided by a number of devices. For example, a keyboard 156 and mouse 157 are connected to bus 130 by controller 155...").

Appendix

5. Brief description of the figures in Microsoft Powerpoint 2000 guide:

Fig. 1: About screen

Fig. 2: Opening screen

Fig. 3: After clicking on "OK"

Fig. 4: After clicking on a layout item

Fig. 5: After clicking on "OK"

Fig. 6: After clicking on an element of the presentation

Fig. 7: After clicking on "Format" and highlighting "Colors and Lines..."

Fig. 8: After clicking on "Colors and Lines..." and then selecting a drop down
menu (to change line properties)

Fig. 9: After selecting a black line

Fig. 10: After selecting drop down menu to change line style

Fig. 11: After choosing line style

Fig. 12: After selecting "Web" tab (to show other properties of element that can
be configured)

Fig. 13: After clicking "OK"

Fig. 14: After deselecting element (to more clearly see the newly configured
element with the designated line properties)

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims and the additional features recited in the amendments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant also argues that Dieberger allegedly only provides unreadable thumbnails of the slides, not an outline. It is noted that the claims do not preclude an

Art Unit: 2178

outline from including unreadable thumbnails of the slides. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). It is unclear what applicant means by "unreadable thumbnails". As best understood by examiner, applicant seems to equate unreadable with items that are not alphabetical letters. While Dieberger does not display letters in the outline, there are many languages that do not use letters, but rather symbols or characters to express ideas. This does not make the slide map of Dieberger (e.g. in paragraph 20, "The slides in the slide show are portrayed in a summary view in a graphical user interface as a slide map or sequential arrangement of cells corresponding to the slides. Each cell visually depicts data describing the slide it represents" and in paragraph 36, "A hierarchy (not shown) of slide maps 106 can allow an increased number of slides to be depicted in summary view 102 if necessary, though most slide shows can be represented by a single slide map 106") any less of an outline. For example, in figure 5 of Microsoft, the column to the left of the slide is referred to as an outline by those of ordinary skill in the art. While it only shows a number and an icon to represent the slide of the presentation, it is still considered an outline. Therefore, the term "outline" was understood by those of ordinary skill in the art to include the slide map of Dieberger. Furthermore, applicant is reminded that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

Art Unit: 2178

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6037943 A	Multimedia digital foil presentation system	Crone; Joanne Elizabeth et al.
US 20030048291 A1	Navigation method for visual presentations	Dieberger, Andreas
US 6590586 B1	User interface for a browser based image storage and processing system	Swenton-Wall; Patricia L. et al.
US 20040104946 A1	System and method for automated positioning of graphic objects	Li, Yufeng
US 6789228 B1	Method and system for the storage and retrieval of web-based education materials	Merril; Jonathan R. et al.
US 20050039131 A1	Presentation management system and method	Paul, Chris
US 20050097470 A1	Rich media event production system and method including the capturing, indexing, and synchronizing of RGB-based graphic content	Dias, James et al.
US 20060080610 A1	Methods, systems and computer program products for outline views in computer displayable presentations	Kaminsky; David L.
US 7281199 B1	Methods and systems for selection of multimedia presentations	Nicol; John Raymond et al.


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Wong whose telephone number is 571-270-1399. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 EST with every other Friday 7:30-4.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William Wong/


ADAM L. BASEHOAR